DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 138 RC 019 257

TITLE	Research Report on Services to Preschoolers. Summary of Findings of the National Survey of State Migrant Education Programs.
INSTITUTION	National Preschool Coordination Project, San Diego, CA.; Research-able, Vienna, VA.
PUB DATE	Sep 91
NOTE	39p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Ancillary School Services; Coordination; *Identification; *Migrant Children; Migrant Education; *Migrant Programs; National Surveys; Preschool Children; *Preschool Education; Social Services; *State Programs; Training

ABSTRACT

In spring 1991, the National Preschool Coordination Project sent a questionnaire regarding preschool services to all state migrant education programs. Over half of the states responded. Findings indicated that: (1) there is a need for improved identification and recruitment of migrant children aged 3-5 years; (2) the majority of jurisdictions offer needs assessment, emergency health, and social service referrals; (3) two in three jurisdictions offer parent training; (4) nearly one in two respondents thinks that less than half of identified children are currently receiving services; (5) current information and resources available to staff are judged to be somewhat or very inadequate by over 60 percent of respondents; (6) most states perceive a need for enhanced interstate coordination; and (7) the majority of respondents lack resources to facilitate interagency and interstate coordination and also lack curriculum in Spanish and other home languages. The report provides detailed findings for each survey question. (KS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED360138

RESEARCH REPORT
on
Services to Preschoolers
by the
National Preschool Coordination Project

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Susan C. Morse
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Summary of Findings
of the
National Survey of State Migrant Education Programs
conducted by Research-able, Inc.

RC019257

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

National Preschool Coordination Project - 1527 West Lewis St, San Diego CA 92103

National Preschool Coordination Project
Administered by:
Central Stream
Migrant Education Program Coordination Center
Texas A&I University
Campus Box 152
Kingsville, Texas 78363

In cooperation with:
San Diego County Office of Education
6401 Linda Vista Road
San Diego, CA 92111

SURVEY RESEARCH FINDINGS

National Preschool Coordination Project

Respectfully Submitted by:

Research-able
501 Niblick Drive, SE
Vienna, VA 22180
[703] 281-3963
fax: [703] 281-4954

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Summary of Findings..... 1

II. Methodology..... 5

III. Detailed Findings..... 6

I. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In the spring of 1991, the National Preschool Coordination Project sent a survey questionnaire regarding preschool services to all State Migrant Education programs. Over 50% of the states responded. The following is a summary of the data drawn from that survey.

Identification & Recruitment

The National Preschool Coordination Project survey documents a need for improved identification and recruitment of migrant children aged 3–5 years.

The following is a summary of the responses to the survey questions relating to identification and recruitment:

Three out of four responding jurisdictions report having only "good" or "fair" identification methods. The jurisdictions who report having "excellent" methods of identifying eligible migrant children aged 3–5 appear to have very small migrant populations.

A quarter of respondents are of the opinion that less than 50% of such eligible children are currently being identified in their jurisdictions. Some respondents are of the opinion that their jurisdictions identify "100%" of eligible preschool–age children.

While the average number of methods used for identifying eligible preschool–age children is over 3, one in five respondents reports that his/her jurisdiction uses only one method for identification; in four out of five of these cases, that one method is identifying 3–5 year olds of previously identified families. Heavy reliance on previously identified families means that a first–born child has a good chance of slipping

through the ID&R net which in turn increases the likelihood of that family slipping through on subsequent children as well. First-born children are significant in other ways as well: they serve as role models to younger siblings and may tend to set the tone for education within their families.

In the majority of states responding to the survey, eligible children are not being referred by employers of migrant workers or by childcare providers and preschools.

In response to this need, the National Preschool Coordination Project is now focusing its efforts on coordination with Head Start and Even Start programs and Early Childhood Education [ECE] services, and is providing its materials to them.

In many cases, recruiters are employed directly by schools, many of which provide no services for the preschool-age child and have no interest in preschool recruitment. The recruiter, with no services to offer the preschool-age child, may have limited motivation to recruit this population. The use of *Smart Start/Listos* by recruiters offers immediate, useful information as a service to preschoolers and their parents.

Asked to suggest ways of resolving the ID&R problem for preschool-age children, a few respondents suggested that additional funding is the answer, but the majority looked to training and coordination for relief.

It is vital that alternative ID&R methods for preschoolers be explored and shared among regions and states through interstate coordination and training.

Early Childhood Education [ECE] Services

The vast majority of jurisdictions responding to the survey offer needs assessment, emergency health, and social service referrals. Two in three jurisdictions offer parent training programs. Three in ten respondents report that two or fewer of the services listed on the questionnaire are currently provided in their jurisdictions. Where this is the case, the services that tend to be provided with the greatest frequency are either part of the ID&R effort or are site-based.

Only one respondent whose jurisdiction provides two or fewer services said that one of those services is home learning programs, and none reported having current parent training programs. On an open-ended basis, respondents report the need for additional preschool and daycare programs as well as parent training programs.

While about one in four respondents is of the opinion that "Less than 50%" of eligible preschool-age children are currently being identified, nearly one in two think that "Less than 50%" of identified children are currently receiving services.

Training

Almost no one characterized available Early Childhood Education [ECE] training in their jurisdictions as "Excellent." Opinion was divided as to whether available ECE training is "Good," only "Fair," or actually "Poor."

At the start of the Project, current information and resources available to staff for the preschool-age child are judged to be "somewhat" or "very inadequate" by over six in ten respondents.

Need for Interstate Coordination

This benchmark study points out that as of the beginning of the National Preschool Coordination Project, most states responding to the survey perceive a need for enhanced interstate coordination. Almost half of these respondents think interstate coordination as currently practiced is either "somewhat" or "very ineffective."

The great majority of respondents lack "resources to facilitate interagency and interstate coordination" [63% lack this] and "curriculum in Spanish and other home languages" [74% lack this]. Large percentages of respondents lack access to "parenting material in English and Spanish" [37% lack this] and "appropriate curriculum for migrant 3–5 year olds" [41% lack this]. The only listed resource available to the great majority of respondents had to do with "early childhood education theory" [only 19% lack this].

The majority of respondents knew enough about the National Preschool Coordination Project at the time of the survey to offer interesting and enthusiastic comments about how the Project has affected their programs thus far and their high expectations for the future.

II. METHODOLOGY

This document reports the findings of the benchmark wave of the National Preschool Coordination Project's mail survey of state migrant education programs throughout the United States.

In February, 1991, questionnaires were mailed to the heads of the migrant education programs in each of the fifty states and in Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and the Northern Mariana Islands. A cover letter from Susan C. Morse, Project Director for the National Preschool Coordination Project, accompanied each questionnaire. In May, a second letter from Ms. Morse, along with a second copy of the questionnaire, was mailed out.

In the end, we received 27 completed surveys, for a completion rate of 51%. Of those 27, 24 were from SEAs; 1 from an LEA; and 2 identified themselves as "Other." Although some of the more populous states in terms of migrant populations did return the survey, others did not.

The questionnaire was developed by the National Preschool Coordination Project staff in consultation with **Research-able**. **Research-able** is an independent, female, minority-owned survey research firm located near Washington, DC, specializing in education, healthcare, and environmental issues. Completed surveys were data processed and analyzed by **Research-able**.

In keeping with the ethical standards of the Council of American Survey Research Organizations [CASRO], **Research-able** rigorously maintains respondents' confidentiality; completed survey questionnaires remain the sole property of **Research-able**.

III. DETAILED FINDINGS

Q.2: Perception of Adequacy of Ways of Identifying Children. About half of all respondents rated the adequacy of their state's current ways of identifying migrant preschool children "good." About a quarter each rated their state "excellent" and "fair." Literally all jurisdictions reporting that they are "excellent" at identifying eligible migrant preschool-age children have extremely limited migrant populations.

Q.3: Perception of Percentage of Eligible Children Being Identified. About half of the respondents thought that between 75-99% of all eligible migrant preschool children are currently being identified in their state. About one respondent in ten thought that 100% were being identified. About one respondent in four thought that less than 50% were currently being identified.

Q.4: How Children Are Being Identified. Respondents were given a list and asked to check all those ways in which eligible children are being identified in their states. The list included the following:

Identification of whole families	93%
3-5 yr olds of previously identified families	74%
Community/Field "searches"	63
Referral by other migrant families	59
Referrals by employers of migrant workers	37
Childcare and preschool referrals	30

On average, respondents checked 3.7 ways in which eligible children are currently being identified. About one in five respondents reported that

their states are using only one method for identification; in four out of five of these cases, that one method is identifying 3–5 year olds of previously identified families.

Q.4a: Other Ways Children Are Being Identified. On an open–ended basis, respondents were asked to list other ways in which eligible children are being identified in their states. Comments include the following:

> *Coordination with Parent and Child Education (PACE) programs. Coordination with Head Start (increasing). Network with community agencies.*
>
> *Generally enrolled when other school–age family members are identified.*
>
> *By referrals from school personnel.*
>
> *K–12 schools, posters, churches, public bulletin boards, work places, community agency referrals, news articles, migrant farm workers associations, health clinics, MSRTS Interstate Reports.*
>
> *In addition to the above methods, "public information" is provided to agencies in home–base states for dissemination to families who have decided to migrate to our state for farm work. This "public information" newsletter/direction of migrant services is also disseminated in local areas where migrant services are available.*
>
> *Identification of pre–schoolers isn't our problem in [our state], you will note by looking at the numbers. More and more our problem is getting the school–age children to attend our summer–only programs.*

Through local agencies such as churches, etc.

I wish we had some additional clever [methods] to report, but I don't.

Through community-based agencies and referrals from schools.

News media: newspapers and radio; community activities: church and social events; posters; local stories of services available to 3-5 years olds.

We have some recruiting efforts.

Local coordinated efforts and staff in the LEAs and Migrant Head Start will meet periodically.

Preschool agencies employ home visitors (to do I&R) whose main focus and thrust are preschool children. Our state's "Child Find" for special education reveals many migrant preschoolers also.

Local recruiters -- MEP projects, UMOS, early childhood/day care coordinator.

Q.4b: Impediments to Identification of Eligible Children. On an open-ended basis, respondents were asked to comment on what they think are the impediments to the identification of eligible 3-5 year olds. The major problems identified had to do with identifying children who have no older siblings in the school system [an answer whose frequency leads us to believe that school-based identification is THE major methodology in current use] and the inherent frustration that goes along with devoting [scarce] resources to identifying a class of children [preschoolers] for whom a jurisdiction may have no services. As one respondent put it:

> **"If Ch. 1 Migrant funds are [the] only funds available, there isn't much of an incentive to find these children, if services can't be provided."**

The preschool child represents a unique problem in terms of identification and service. If the family has no school age children, it appears that in many states the child 3–5 years old is unlikely to be identified. The challenge for migrant education is to devise adequate means for identifying and serving this subset of preschool–age children which does not further strain already tight budgets. As oldest children in a family, this subset is of particular importance within the family as role models to younger siblings and as a good beginning for parents in terms of reinforcing a notion that schooling and related services are important and attainable.

Comments with regard to this question included the following:

> *Lack of coordination and communication among agencies with common purpose. Resistance to adopting new strategies by LEAs.*
>
> *If [the child has] no older siblings in school, then [he or she] is not located.*
>
> *Since funding is not generated for 0–2 year–olds it is difficult to get districts to understand the importance of identifying ALL eligible children at the time of the parent interview so that the child is in the system. It is much more difficult to pick up the children later.*
>
> *Not being aware that such children are present in an area when older siblings of school age are not present. [There are] no state preschool programs in place. LEAs are reluctant to identify preschoolers for fear their MEP will suffer.*

Lack of formal contact with [a] single agency.

Not locating the families; misidentification by ethnicity (Hispanic, etc.).

[These children are] not in school so [they are] harder to find.

If [the children] don't have older siblings, [it] may be hard to get [a] lead on [their] location. Also LEP status -- unable to speak English.

Our recruiters wear many different hats in our migrant program. They tend to depend on referrals from the schools when identifying migrant families. Families with children 3-5 years old, who do not have older siblings in the school may fall through the cracks. Presently, we are trying to beef up our I&R activities in high impact areas with community-based recruiters.

Due to lack of funds, [we] have no money to provide programs.

During the school year, families who only have children who are not yet eligible/enrolled in kindergarten may miss being identified, particularly if [they are] residing in an area with few other migrant families.

Not a problem right now.

Few of [our] 5 year-olds are offered public kindergarten programs, so the only way to locate young children is by visiting the farms and talking to farm-related persons. If a family settles out while their child/children is/are age 3-5, we are not likely to locate them.
The unobscure nature of existence when there are no children

attending schools; and the nature of mobility whereby parents do not want to identify themselves.

Funds.

Mobility of families in the community. Language barrier (multi-cultural groups). Housing or living quarters (families are hard to locate -- no telephone or address).

Lack of time, trained staff, and awareness.

Reluctance of parents to have office staff identify children. Information on this age group has frequently not been available. This population group has not been served adequately in the past.

They are not always already in programs (e.g., schools). If Ch.1 migrant funds are [the] only funds available, there isn't much of an incentive to find these children, if services can't be provided.

We have been improving through training of recruiters, but there have been instances of only school children being reported; we are working on this.

Q.4c: Suggested Resolutions to Problems of Identifying Eligible Children. Respondents suggested the following ways of resolving the problems they encounter in trying to identify eligible 3–5 year old children. While a few thought additional funding would be the answer, the majority looked to training and coordination for relief:

Training and more coordination between and among agencies.

Training of local educators on how to serve preschoolers. Re–ordering our service priorities. Using home–school liaison personnel to locate eligible children.

Need to actively identify and recruit for this age group. Train school staff on identification for qualifying for migrant services.

Recruiters contacting referrals from migrant parents. Emphasize to employers [the] importance of cooperation with recruiters. Emphasize importance of identifying birth [through] age 3 migrants to recruiters and all concerned. Bilingual recruiters sought.

Lobby Washington for more money.

Efforts to identify migrant children throughout the state are being expanded to succeed where other methods might miss the family. This effort includes the use of regional outreach workers who may cover many miles and make numerous contacts to identify potentially eligible families.

At the moment I have none.

More aggressive media (appropriate) use and with non–traditional or stereotypical religious organizations.

Full funding of the National Migrant Education.

Better housing or living quarters for migrant parents. ESL classes for the parents at the local level.

We are increasing our recruiting efforts hopefully.

More frequent and coordinated efforts among all federal and state officers. State-wide advertising about support services and educational services for this age group.

All service providers for preschool children working together, pulling resources and expertise, to provide a comprehensive package [e.g., DSHS daycare, Head Start, and school districts providing services in a local site so that an interview of parents would get information for each program needed -- i.e., I.& R. -- rather than every entity needing to conduct a fact-finding interview.

Q.4d: Other Ways of Identifying Eligible Children. Respondents were asked on an open-ended basis to comment on other ways they thought should be used to identify eligible children aged 3-5. Suggestions tended to focus on enhancing coordination, training, and communication efforts.

Communicate with other units within SEA (Early Childhood, Special Education, Food and Nutrition, Health Services).

Recruiter training emphasizing accessing ALL leads mentioned above. Training for school-based personnel completing ID or school enrollment form.

Proactive notification from one state to another of the known

relocation of a migrant family should be enhanced/utilized to alert identification. For a variety of reasons, this is idealistic. Increased funding and availability of needed migrant preschool services would attract migrant families.

Our population of migrant–eligible families is anything but dense, so I think we're doing well. All ideas and suggestions are accepted, however!

More ethnographic approaches to define communities or colonies of migrants. Also, more widespread approaches to communicate messages through grassroots organizations.

Statewide recruiters in education and health services.

Networking with other agencies that serve migrant workers (i.e., OHDC or MIC). Bilingual and bicultural staff in identifying migrant families with children ages 3–5.

Request specific information from sending states, such as Texas, Arizona and California.

Have some State staff committed to I&R of children (including preschool, O.O.S., etc.) in a state where migrants are typically (expected to be) found. This works relatively well in [our state].

Q.5: Services Currently Provided to Eligible Children. Respondents were given a list of services and asked to check all that are currently being provided to eligible 3–5 year old children in their jurisdictions. Nine in ten jurisdictions offer needs assessment, emergency health, and social service referrals. Two in three jurisdictions responding to the survey offer parent training programs. The remainder of the listed services are offered in about six in ten responding jurisdictions.

Needs assessment, emergency health, and social service referrals	90%
Parent trainings	67
Home learning programs	59
Site–based Migrant Education programs	59
Site–based programs funded by other agencies	59

The average respondent reported that 3.2 of the five listed services are provided in his/her jurisdiction to eligible 3–5 year old children. The question remaining, of course, is the percentage of eligible children [or even of identified children] who actually receive these services. Eight of the twenty–seven respondents report that in their jurisdictions 2 or fewer of the listed services are currently provided. Where this is the case, the services that tend to be provided with the greatest frequency are either part of the ID&R effort or are site–based:

Needs assessment, etc. [5 mentions]
Site–based Migrant Ed programs [4 mentions]
Site–based programs funded by others [2 mentions]

Only one respondent whose jurisdiction provides two or fewer services said that one of those services is home learning programs, and none of these respondents reported having current parent training programs.

Q.5a: Additional Services Currently Being Provided to Eligible Children. Respondents were asked to comment on an open–ended basis on additional services currently being offered to eligible 3–5 year old children in their jurisdictions. Comments include the following:

Regular education programs. Half– and full–day kindergarten, 4–year old preschool/early childhood. By 1991, daycare in schools.

Alternate agencies provide Head Start, or Even Start programs.

Food service from National Child Nutrition Programs.

Welfare efforts.

Dental and nutrition.

Migrant Head Start provides day care. LEA migrant home tutoring to children and parents. Other programs for which migrant children qualify: Ch.1 Basic, Head Start, State–funded early intervention Programs. Aid with clothes, food, if necessary. Nutrition counseling. Health (assist [with] immunizations and physicals).

Currently migratory preschoolers participate in the Parent Tutorial Project. We also try to place students in Head Start programs. During the summer, we have a few site–based summer programs. Our system has a special program for preschoolers and parents one morning a week. And a school library has started programs targeting preschool migrants.

Migrant Even Start.

Comprehensive health services are provided while children are

enrolled in the program and following the program to continue and complete health screenings and needed treatment.

None consistently.

The Home Learning is a monthly mailing to parents including child development information and activities to do with young children.

Coordinated efforts with JTPA (Department of Labor) and health agencies, and Immigration Reform Act training.

Chapter 1–M accident insurance. Home Start programs. Home preschool programs. County Children and Youth Services Commission.

Provide meals and snacks each day, transportation, educational services for 4–5 year olds.

Referrals to Head Start programs [and] public schools' early childhood programs.

Accident insurance coverage, physical examination (with migrant funds). Access to all other programs: e.g., Head Start, ECEAP, Even Start, special education, district preschools, summer schools.

Q.5b: Additional Services That Should Be Provided to Eligible Children. Respondents were asked to come up with additional services they think should be provided to eligible 3–5 year old children [and by extension, their families]. Suggestions tended to focus on the extension of existing services in the areas of Head Start, daycare, parent training, health screening and insurance to all eligible children. Comments include the following:

Migrant Head Start, daycare.

Insurance, more uniform services.

More home tutoring for migrant children and parents.

Preschool programs to serve all eligible migrant children. More day care services or Head Start programs.

All services that can be provided . . . educational/supportive, etc.

Increased funding is needed to operate programs for the unserved in the State and more importantly for the unserved children under five years of age [who] reside in the State and could benefit from a comprehensive, family–oriented child development program, similar to migrant Head Start.

Nutrition, transportation, instructional (ECE [Early Childhood Education]–based programs in readiness activities).

Kindergarten and Head Start programs!

Pre–school, home–based schooling, pre–/postnatal care for young women and men.

Family resource libraries.

Health services at the local level to the migrant children ages 3–5.

Ensure that each 3–5 year old has access to an appropriate early childhood program.

Parent training and home–based programs. Additional site–based programs.

Childcare, dental services, insurance.

Health.

More developmentally appropriate instruction –– methods which are culturally and linguistically appropriate also.

Q.5c: Perception of Percentage of Eligible Children Receiving Services. In this question, respondents were asked to estimate the percentage of eligible migrant children age 3–5 in their jurisdictions who actually received services during 1989–90. Two respondents were of the opinion that their jurisdictions had managed to serve all eligible children in that timeframe. The largest single group of responses thought their jurisdictions had served 75–99% of eligible 3–5 year olds. The next largest group were those who thought their jurisdictions had served "Less than 10%." Forty–four percent of respondents thought their jurisdictions had served less than fifty percent of eligible 3–5 year old children during 1989–90:

Percentage served in 1989–90	Percentage Respondents
100%	7 %
75 – 99%	33
50 – 74%	15
25 – 49	19
10 – 24%	4
Less than 10%	22

Q.5d: Perception of Percentage of Eligible Children Who Will Have Received Services During 1990–91. In general, respondents were hopeful that 1990–91 would see an increase in the percentage of eligible 3–4 year old served in their jurisdictions. Thus, only 33% [compared with 44% for 1989–90] thought that their jurisdictions will have served less than 50% of eligible children during 1990–91. The perception of improvement is occurring at the margins, however; just about the same percentage as in 1989–90 think their jurisdictions will serve 75% or more of eligible children in 1990–91:

Percentage served in 1989–90	Percentage Respondents
100%	7 %
75 – 99%	37
50 – 74%	22
25 – 49	14
10 – 24%	4
Less than 10%	15

Q.6: Perception of Adequacy of Available Early Childhood Education [ECE] Training. Only two respondents characterized available ECE training as "Excellent." Opinion was divided as to whether the training available in this area is "Good," only "Fair," or actually "Poor:"

Excellent	7	%
Good	37	
Fair	30	
Poor	26	

Q.7: Early Childhood Education [ECE] Training Currently Used. At the time of the survey, staff in two responding states had completed training offered by the National Preschool Coordination Project. In addition, staff in 30% of responding states had utilized NPCP materials and information.

Conferences on ECE, Parenting & Preschool	70	%
Interagency Coordination/Training	67	
MEPCC Training	48	
NPCP Materials/Information	30	
NPCP Training	7	

Q.7a: Additional Early Childhood Education [ECE] Training Opportunities Currently Available. Respondents were asked to comment on an open-ended basis as to additional early childhood training opportunities are currently available to Migrant Education staff [and others] in their states:

> *Early childhood is mandated under [our State's] Educational Reform Act -- much training is anticipated.*

Summer college training. Summer migrant cluster workshops.

Other units within SEA, Title 7 -- DYSART School, Head Start.

Early childhood education, [our State's Dept. of Education], providers, parents, Migrant Head Start.

Curriculum workshops held jointly with other districts, R/TAC services, state intervention workshops, escort training, district summer workshops.

Migrant staff have received inservice training by the regional staff as well as obtaining training through contracted early childhood specialists. Most of the training is done one-on-one at specific locations.

Migrant Even Start.

Training provided by East Coast Migrant Head Start.

Trainers from local colleges and regional Head Start Resource Centers are used, as well as the purchase and rental of videotapes and films.

Ours in intensive now -- six hours a day!

[Our State's] Technical Institute -- courses and special events.

None or very limited.

Workshops at the local level, county PAC meetings. Workshops at the State Migrant Parent Conferences. Chapter 1 winter conference. Children Services Division. Head Start. Migrant and

Indian Coalition. State, local, district, and professional organization–sponsored training and conferences. Escort–sponsored activities.

There are many services available; however, coordination needs to be emphasized and services need to be accessed so that we are aware of training offered.

We provide a strand for preschool providers at our annual migrant education statewide conference, special trainings are planned by ECE providers and Ch.1 Migrant pays travel/expenses/staff time for staff to attend. Special sessions are done in small groups and/or individually by OSPI, and a special ECE training specialist is funded by OSPI to work this spring in a CBO.

SEA provides assistance in training through services of Chapter 1 early childhood education specialist.

Q.7b: Perception of Additional Early Childhood Education [ECE] Training Opportunities That Should Be Available. Respondents were asked to list on an open–ended basis additional ECE training opportunities they think should be available. Even though the two previous two questions were understood by respondents to deal with training **sources** [e.g., NPCP, Migrant Ed programs, etc.], this question elicited a number of training **topics** as well as sources:

Increased inservice during the year.

Ethnic [multiculture] and migrant family situation.

How young children learn.

Regional seminars regarding testing, evaluating, educational materials, modality for migrant staff at all levels.

Better dispensation of state-of-the-art information pertaining [to] the early childhood activities or programs for migrant children. Examples: home activities for parents; bilingual kindergarten.

In general, our State needs more of the same. More funds to afford quality trainers and the cost of longer training sessions are needed for effective outcomes.

None [other than university classes].

The entire spectrum.

Site visits to other programs in the State and out of state conferences.

Some additional conferences on early childhood, etc.

The full gamut of training, materials, and methodologies should be made available. Other federal and State resources and private organizations should help provide information and training, such as TAC, R-TAC and PCC.

More appropriate [developmentally appropriate] staff development training. Follow-up to ensure it's implemented correctly as needed.

Preparing the environment to assure quality health and safety needs addressed. Projects funded by other than SEA preschool projects often are lacking setting up quality learning centers to give

youngsters a rich learning environment.

Q.8 – 10: Perception of Effectiveness of Coordination. On a 4–point scale, from "very effective" to "not at all effective," respondents were asked to rank the effectiveness of interstate, intrastate, and interagency coordination for migrant children age 3–5:

	Interstate	Intrastate	Interagency
Very effective	8 %	31 %	19 %
Somewhat effective	46	39	63
Somewhat ineffective	31	31	15
Very ineffective	15	--	4

Q.8a: Suggested Ways to Improve Effectiveness of Interstate Coordination. Respondents were asked on an open–ended basis to comment on ways to improve interstate coordination. Comments included the following:

Better advance notification.

Our small preschool population limits services received.

More complete and more timely.

Continue to communicate. Working on exchange programs with [two other counties]. There is a great amount of mobility between these areas.

Utilization of health and educational records by receiving migrant project and continue areas of the LEA migrant education projects

contacting areas of services.

Follow same procedures as for children 5+, use ESANS form, follow receiving state guidelines as for 5+ kids.

Possibly setting up some kind of committee [national] to look at the needs, as well as the directions for serving this age group.

Revamp the entire process, taking the decision out of the feud in Washington and provide true consultation to states.

Need for increased information especially health/immunizations handicapping conditions.

What is needed is an incentive, either a carrot [financial reward for the program] and a stick [some punitive measure], to further encourage interstate coordination, particularly in a proactive effort to provide information when a child moves from one state to another.

We need training that will focus on multicultural aspects of migrant children. Meaningful, developmentally appropriate activities, especially in language acquisition for young children.

More awareness of needs and resources available. There is a lot of ground work to be done.

Better communication between State directors and staff. Site visits to other State Chapter 1 migrant programs. Make preschool 3–5 year old issues a priority of the PCCs, of national conferences.

Better use of MSRTS.

The federal agencies who have responsibility for serving this age group need to develop letters of agreement and provide effective leadership so that better coordination can be implemented at the state and local levels.

Regional meetings sponsored by technical assistance centers.

Efforts like this one on specific topics.

Even Start projects should be sharing more through the PCC -- it has been too limited.

Q.9a: Suggested Ways to Improve Effectiveness of Intrastate Coordination. Respondents were asked on an open-ended basis to suggest ways to improve the effectiveness of inTRAstate coordination for eligible migrant preschool children age 3-5. Comments included the following:

Better identification and recruitment, MSRTS.

Train migrant staff to alert receiving districts, improve tracking of education services for this population, training parents to better understand importance of conveying travel plans to district staff.

Establishing a preschool migrant literacy committee to address all areas of concern with this population. Be dependable, report results of good efforts and provide follow-up letters.

Let NASDME decide what is needed for interstate coordination.

Efforts need to continue in addressing the appropriate developmental placement of the child. In addition, combined efforts

must be made to increase the length of services available to preschool children to enhance the development of language and social–adaptive skills in order to better assure school success.

We need some kind of meaningful reporting system for MSRTS–developmental checklists, etc., with a more holistic approach –– not just isolated skills.

More long–term planning and development.

Have interstate newsletter on the 3–5 year old child. Have key Chapter 1–M staff meet with other states.

More time and effort needed.

The State Migrant Education Program is currently in the process of developing memorandums of agreement with the State and local JTPA staff, Migrant Head Start staff, and [the] State health staff.

Joint coordination for all providers involved with young children. Coordinated sessions with parents; too much depletion when each entity goes its own way.

Q.10a: Suggested Ways to Improve Effectiveness of Interagency Coordination. Again on an open–ended basis, respondents were asked to suggest ways to improve the effectiveness of interagency coordination. Comments included the following:

Break "turf" barriers.

Presently no migrant health services available outside [of the

southwestern] areas of [our State].

Funding and priorities are a problem.

More communication among agencies.

Involve other agencies (HRS, etc.) in appropriate migrant meetings, appropriate migrant staff should serve as board members on community organizations.

Form an interagency committee (NASDME, JTPA, MIG Health, MIG Head Start, MIG Christian, etc.) which would deal only with interagency coordination. This is in the meeting by NASDME.

Improved public relations and ability to enhance local services who may be able to help migrant families but may be overwhelmed by the demand and/or the differing needs of the population would help to improve interagency coordination.

Many identified preschoolers do no attend preschool in sending states due to lack of resources.

Communicate with and set up interagency task force for the State.

Have interagencies meet to discuss and plan ways to serve the 3–5 year old children.

Clear definitions of early childhood agreements so parents, local projects, providers know which children will be served. After a local project prepares for 6 year olds, the [State Council] takes them when short on numbers; yet they are not prepared. And a program like National Head Start should clarify if 3–5 ages [or 3–6!] and ensure it guarantees operating consistently.

Q.11: Perceived Adequacy of Current Information/Resources. Respondents were asked to rate, on a four-point scale, their perception of the adequacy of current information/resources available to them concerning migrant children age 3-5. The majority of respondents found current resources at least somewhat inadequate:

Very adequate	15 %
Somewhat adequate	23
Somewhat inadequate	54
Very inadequate	8

Q.12, 12a, 12b: Information/Resources Available. Given a list of information/resources concerning migrant children age 3-5, respondents were asked to check all those that are currently available to them. While most have early childhood education theory available to them, less than four in ten have resources to facilitate interagency and interstate coordination, and only one in four have curriculum in Spanish or other home languages to offer.

Early childhood education theory	82 %
Parenting material in English and Spanish	63
Appropriate curriculum for migrant 3-5 yr olds	59
Resources to facilitate interagency and interstate coordination	37
Curriculum in Spanish or other home languages	26

On an open-ended basis, respondents were asked to comment on additional information/resources available to them:

IMEC, continual resources for at-risk preschool.

Funding by migrant Head Start for services during summer.

Visions, Memo, Even Start materials, consultants through PCCs.

Even Start -- Eastern Stream -- out of Loudonsville, NY [STATE Parent Tutorial Project].

East Coast Migrant Head Start Project materials.

Health resources.

Currently we work with Dept of Health and Environmental Services, Migrant Council and summer nutritional programs. Not much else is available to us.

The information available I am certain is available. The problem is that it would probably require full-time persons or person to devote the time to that task only.

Children's Service Division; Head Start.

Only some of 12 above.

State colleges and university departments responsible for early childhood education.

Some excellent human resources in State!

They were then asked to comment on additional information/resources they would like to have available to them:

Funding for early childhood care.

Multiculture education and migrant family resources.

Day care available. Funding for day care and parent training.

Training materials such as video tapes, booklets, successful practices/programs nationwide.

Home activities for parents -- bilingual -- available from Texas.

Early identification and coordination for handicapped migrant children.

Improved quality and availability of resources for disabilities/special needs of migrant preschool children are a critical need. More research on migrant families and particularly migrant preschool children is also needed.

On-site assistance, coaching and training.

Ideas for 2-dimensional materials which promote dimensional, concrete learning. [For use in monthly packets -- your newsletter is on the right tract.]

The information coming from the National Preschool Coordination Project is lively and exciting. More of it would certainly be welcome.

How other states are meeting the needs of migrant children ages 3-4 [articles in the memo, migrant education, etc.].

I would like to receive any publications specializing in the issues of

migrant children aged 3–5; appropriate curriculum and exemplary practices.

Present source would be okay, if available.

Information that has worked in other states, and the addresses and representatives who can be contacted for this job.

Videotapes to use with staff and parents. Abstracts of successful models for center–based and home–based services for migrant children ages 3–5. Assessment procedures to assure effectiveness of program for young children. Procedural steps for start–up of in–home program models.

Q.13: Comments Regarding the National Preschool Coordination Project. Finally, respondents were asked to comment on an open–ended basis as to whether the National Preschool Coordination Project has affected their programs at the present time. Comments included the following:

Updated ideas and presented new views.

It has made a definite impact on the awareness, education and direction of early childhood education and its needs. The newsletter, Visions, has been disseminated.

Received . . . newsletter . . .

Receipt of Visions.

We plan on using your activity packed newsletter this year.

We're pleased to include the newsletter as a resource to our eager parents.

It has helped "open some ears and eyes" that there are people working hard at making a difference for preschool migrant children.

The National Preschool Coordination Project is new in our area.

Yes, we have a representative on the National Committee who has assisted us in identifying resources such as staff and materials for the state–wide annual conference.

I would like information on the National Preschool Coordination Project.

Awareness by more staff of the potential.

The materials have been welcomed and will be useful as more service models become available.

We appreciate the opportunity to be involved in the survey and this worthwhile project. We would appreciate receiving information regarding issues affecting migrant early childhood programs/services and ICC meeting minutes as appropriate.

I believe the kinds of info[rmation] you are reporting are meaningful. But like all good things there is not enough, or not enough of your good things. You are doing a much needed program.